



# MEMO

**To:** James Caruso  
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

**From:** Nora De Cuir

**Cc:** Tammy Seale

**Date:** September 20, 2010

**Re:** Climate Action Plan, Development and the Built Environment Stakeholder Discussion  
Summary from August 24, 2010

## Discussion Summary

The Development and the Built Environment Stakeholder Discussion began with an overview of the County's Climate Action Plan initiative from James Caruso, the County's project manager. Consultant project manager, Tammy Seale, presented an overview of a climate action plan's contents and additional details on how reduction measures are developed and how they related to existing policy and programs. Following these presentations, participants were asked to informally discuss the opportunities for reduction measures that were provided to them in their meeting packets. Participants discussed a broad variety of topics related to homebuilding, commercial development and the built environment. However, the following key issues were prominent features of the discussion:

- Enhance the market to justify investment in energy efficient development and retrofits on existing stock. Education, marketing and outreach programs create a more informed public therefore creating more demand for energy efficiency.
- Explore onsite energy production through PV, natural cooling, day lighting, etc.
- Provide incentives to developers and public to ensure financial viability of investment
- Focus on mixed-use development and retrofitting existing development stock

Participants in this group suggested that investment in marketing and education would help to stimulate demand for energy efficient practices. A more detailed record of the discussion is provided below. The Discussion Notes section provides the summary of the discussion as recorded from the facilitator's perspective. The section does not provide responses to or analysis of the stakeholders' comments. PMC's next step will be to use the stakeholder comments to inform the selection and refinement of draft GHG reduction measures.

## Discussion Notes

### Facilitator Question: What's missing? What needs to be taken a step further?

- Schools? How do they fit in?
  - VMT connection

- Lack of use of Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S)
  - Peak times for vehicles idling
- Sustainability coordination for schools
- Provide incentives, grants, collaboration, rooftops
- Education of youth
- SR2S – bikes for kids
- Buildings – next step. Get beyond cons.
- AB 117 – Marin Example
- Onsite energy production
  - PV
  - Natural Cooling
  - Title 24
- Onsite not just PV
  - Day lighting, etc. (add to text)
  - Hot water
  - Go beyond state and federal regulations
- How do we integrate this into production of housing?
  - Economic integration
- Cost
- Constraints of 'one-off' development
- Disconnect with Title 24
- Local might work better
- Focus on new homes small
  - Retrofit existing
  - Look like existing for marketability
  - Multifamily – green features, more feasible
- Cost – expenditure for builder, savings for owner
  - Incentives for financial viability
- Resale of existing homes
  - Challenge of strong realtor lobby
  - Point of sale retrofits
  - Alternatives
- Labeling and disclosure
  - Ex: Austin
  - Buyers then know
  - Informed renter
  - All together
- Multifamily
- COSE energy challenge
  - Strategy missing
  - 1.2.1 COSE missing
- Buyer expectations
  - Rural
  - Education of impacts
  - Outreach to public

- Money savings
  - Green listings criteria
- 1400 new homes a year? {clarified under Additional Comments section}
  - Energy efficiency standards for resale
  - Where is the problem
  - New/No?
- Education
  - Hard to do
- Car ratings, appliance, etc. education technology for homes
- Realtor education
  - Clients
  - Starting point
  - MLS include 'green features'
- Where do you build?
  - Energy used in transportation is more significant
  - Jobs/shopping close to housing
- Marketing
  - Problem controlling energy use for buyers
  - Use 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification (SLO Green Build) = more sales?
- Costs are more, but hard to extrapolate
- Convert lease type
- Informed public
  - Example:. Integration into building stock
- Shoot for reduced (whole) cost and reduced regulation
  - Streamlined permitting
  - Mixed uses – planning traditional
  - Critical part
- Higher density – challenges
- Planned developments
- HOA's
- Need lower cost
- Or – higher cost
- Cost – connection to informed public, direct cost
- Combo of low/high/direct cost
  - Ex. Alleys
  - Planning prevented this
  - Additional cost
- Regulation, planning, consumer demand
- HOA's - # of units
- Big OK, not small
- 5 challenges
  - Land, lack of density, lack of demand, lack of public support
- Time, 3 – 5 years
- Education a real challenge
- Force rational decisions through

- Tax on gas, electricity
- High energy and water cost
  - Baseline, so not to impact affordable housing
- Different motivation...inspire w/cohesive message, e.g. recycling
- Invest in marketing for behavior modifications
- Need to address existing
- Incentives, behavior change
- Gas costs can change behavior but...recession
- Challenge of political feasibility
- Subsidies and incentives
  - E.g. energy audits
  - Biggest motivator to public
  - E.g. other countries
  - Tax increases?
  - Carbon re – imports
- Incentives of implementation because of cost/benefit
- Air conditioning at retailers, need tax
- Incentives for sliding door
  - Difference local/national
- Cost of energy
  - Utility tiering
  - Affordable for low income
  - Impacts completeness
  - Small commercial
    - Make it pencil out
    - E.g. lighting, incandescent 'look'
    - Educate re: other options
  - What about a sign? (free)
  - Marketing – part of the solution
- Program
  - Energy rating
  - County pays for program
  - Calculate reasonable targets
  - E.g. restaurant ratings, A, B, C, etc.
- Challenge of implementation
  - Political feasibility
  - Real incentives – not punitive
  - Don't just minimize loss
- Connect to health
- Real incentives
  - Research & follow up
  - Speed of process for approval
    - 18 months rather than 3 years
  - Cost savings as marketing – united front
  - 'ratings' or certification must push on commercial, build on Energy Star

- Parking/infrastructure (cost revenue\_
  - Small permits over the counter solar, water 9lower cost too), city/county cost difference
  - Easy and affordable standard
- Park & Ride
  - Shuttles
  - Transit from outlying areas
  - BRT
  - Get people to jobs
  - Parking s incentive in outlying areas
- Water use
  - Lawns
  - Treatment & pumping
  - Gray water
  - H2O = electricity
- Roofs – sell power back?
  - Pays for self
- Make it easy
- Water – retrofit yard to low H2O
- Education “Cash for grants”
- Overall education for youth
  - Long term strategy
  - Value of resources
  - Quality of life
  - Bikes
  - Lights
  - Water
  - Recognize accomplishments, things can change
- Natural lighting education
- Point of sale
  - Audits – translate to rating, graduated scale
  - Flex timeframe for mandatory
- 2030 challenge task force
  - Key next steps
  - Coordination of inspector/rating over years
  - \$500 disclosure
  - Tie to tenants
  - Potential for local coordination effort
- Cooperation between CSD’s needed
  - No strategy for sustainable community
  - Need long range planning
  - Coordination is very hard
- Waste
  - Cold Canyon closing green waste composting
  - Need best practices
  - Green waste disposal – get away from burning

- Or haul long distance
  - Small operations needed
- Recognition incentive
  - SLO Green Build
  - People seem to appreciate it
  - Affordable
  - Composting filters
- Priority?
  - Energy ratings for buildings
  - Resale/point of sale for residential
  - Carbon tax
  - PACE/AB 811
  - Water conservation
  - Bike improvements
  - Challenge – no credit
- Good opportunities SLO County visionary
- Local labeling food - purchasing
- CSAs
- History of local production
- Education

### **Additional Comments**

- Participant Jerry Bunin provided the following clarification: *Since 1990, countywide 1,382 new homes have been permitted annually on average and 27,646 in total for the 20 years. The unincorporated county's annual average permitted is 689 new homes or 49.8 % of the yearly total. Countywide, there are about 118,000 homes with 40 % in the unincorporated area.*

### **Attendees**

#### Stakeholders

Dick Wilhoit, Estrella Associates  
Jerry Bunin, Homebuilders Association  
Dave Clew, SLO County General Services  
Jerry Rioux, SLO County Housing Trust Fund  
Jutta Jacobs, SLO County Realtors  
Andy Pease, SLO Green Build  
John Hostetter, RECE Solar  
Jim Duffy, C4/SLO Green Build, Architect  
Ken Haggard, C4/SLO Green Build, Architect  
Turko Semmes, C4/SLO Green Build, Architect  
Ken Smokaska

#### Long Range Planning Staff

James Caruso  
Chuck Stevenson

Mike Wulkan

PMC staff  
Tammy Seale  
Nora De Cuir